

Minutes

City of Loma Linda

Department of Community Development

Planning Commission

Chair Neff called a regular meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 7:05 p.m., **Wednesday, July 7, 2004**, in the City Council Chambers, 25541 Barton Road, Loma Linda, California.

Commissioners Present: Randy Neff, Chair
Mary Lee Rosenbaum, Vice Chair
Michael Christianson
Charles Umeda

Staff Present: Deborah Woldruff, Director, Community Development
Richard Holdaway, City Attorney
Rolland Crawford, Director/Fire Chief, Public Safety
Lori Lamson, Senior Planner
Raul Colunga, Assistant Planner
Allan Peñaflorida, Planning Technician
Jeff Peterson, Associate Engineer, Public Works Department
Jocelyne Larabie, Administrative Secretary

ITEMS TO BE DELETED OR ADDED

Director Woldruff stated that there were no items to be added or deleted. However, she added that staff would ask for a continuance for Item 3 – Tentative Parcel Map No. 16477 and that it might be appropriate to address the item first. Director Woldruff introduced Mr. Charles Umeda who had been appointed to the Planning Commission by City Council.

Chair Neff, on behalf of the Planning Commission, congratulated Mr. Umeda on his appointment. Mr. Umeda thanked the Chair and stated that he was looking forward to working with the Commission.

ORAL REPORTS/PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Ms. Kathy Glendrange, 26551 Beaumont Avenue, commented on the fact that the Planning Commission had closed the public hearing and would not be taking further public testimony before voting on Draft General Plan. She appealed to the Commission to read the language of the Hillside Land Use provisions once more to ensure that the decision they make reflected the will of the residents of Loma Linda. She also commented that the Draft General Plan as presented would allow for the extensive development of the South Hills, therefore, sacrificing the beauty of the hills, and the health and well being of the community.

Mr. Jay Gallant, 26284 Cresthaven Court, addressed the Commission to comment on the projects that the Planning Commission had recently approved. He commented that some years ago, the City had devised a Strategic Action Plan, which included a large amount of open space. He added that the current trend of high-density projects was going against that plan. He further commented on the increase in traffic, and the resulting bad air quality, and pointed out that each home built without commercial development to provide for the new residents was a financial burden to the City.

Georgia Hodgkin, 24360 Lawton, stated that she wanted to speak on the General Plan. She encouraged the Planning Commission to change their ruling to close the public hearing and allow the residents of Loma Linda further input. She pointed out that many changes had been made to the text of the plan and that it was important to listen to what the public had to say before the Planning Commission voted to recommend the plan to the City Council.

Chair Neff thanked Ms. Hodgkin for taking the time to come forward to present her concerns. He added that she could provide all her comments in writing to Staff who would present them to Consultant Mr. Zola of LSA Associates.

Director Woldruff encouraged the public to provide staff with their comments and concerns. She added that all comments, either written or verbal, were reviewed by both staff and Mr. Zola and presented to the Planning Commission.

CONTINUED ITEMS

PUBLIC HEARING

PC-04-32 - TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO.16477 - A request to subdivide the vacant area located at west end of the Loma Linda Plaza from the rest of the center, thereby creating a 3.18-acre parcel (Parcel 1) and a 10.02-acre parcel (Parcel 2). The site is located in the Neighborhood Business (C-1) zone, on the northwest corner of Barton Road and Mountain View Avenue.

Chair Neff asked if a staff would be presented. Director Woldruff explained that no report would be presented because the applicant has requested for a continuance.

City Attorney Rich Holdaway informed the Planning Commission that it would be appropriate to accept public testimony on the item from those who would not be able to be present at the August 4, 2004 meeting.

Chair Neff opened the public comment period at 7:15 pm and closed it at 7:16 pm, as there was no comments from the public.

Motion by Christianson, seconded by Rosenbaum, and carried with a vote of 4-0 to continue agendaize Item #3 to the regular meeting of August 4, 2004.

PC-04-33 - CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP) NO. 04-01 - A Healthier Las Brasas restaurant is requesting to sell beer and wine for on-site consumption in conjunction with food service at an existing restaurant location. The restaurant is located at 25596 Barton Road.

Planning Technician Allan Peñaflorida presented the staff report. He stated that Conditional Use Permit (CUP) No. 04-01 was a request to sell beer and wine for on-site consumption at an existing restaurant, A Healthier Las Brasas, located at 25596 Barton Road in a Neighborhood Business Zone. He explained that A Healthier Las Brasas was a full service restaurant that had been in operation for approximately five years at the current location and occupied a suite of approximately 2,040 square-feet of gross floor area. He added the restaurant served lunch and dinner seven days a week. Mr. Peñaflorida concluded his description by stating that none of the six restaurants in the Plaza, including A Healthier Las Brasas, served beer or wine.

Mr. Peñaflorida explained that Development Code Amendment (DCA) No. 00-01 permits on-site consumption of beer and wine in the Administrative and Professional Office (AP), Neighborhood Business (C-1), and General Commercial (C-2) zones, subject to the approval of a Conditional Use Permit. He added that the amendment stipulated that the ancillary alcohol use could only be established in conjunction with a primary use of a restaurant having a floor area of 2,000 square feet or greater. Mr. Peñaflorida continued to say that the proposed use was not inconsistent with the General Plan or specifically with the Neighborhood Business designation, would not be detrimental to the public health and safety, and would not impact the existing business in a negative manner.

Mr. Peñaflorida concluded his report stating that staff recommended that the Planning Commission approve Conditional Use Permit (CUP) No. 04-01 based on the Findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval.

No public comment was presented.

Chair Neff commented that a similar issue had come before the Commission in the past and recalled that the owner of that establishment was required to provide a list of guidelines to the serving staff. He asked if the same condition could be applied to this project. Director Woldruff commented that the project he referred to was the Secret Garden and concurred that the list could be added to the Conditions of Approval. Commissioner Christianson mentioned that it was a training program for servers in establishments where beer and wine was served. Senior Planner Lamson explained that most of the guidelines had been incorporated into the Conditions of Approval, however staff would provide the necessary information to the owner.

Motion by Umeda, seconded by Christianson, and carried by a vote of 4-0, to approve Conditional Use Permit (CUP) No. 04-01 based on the Findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval as amended.

PC-04-34 - GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT (GP) NO. 04-01, ZONE CHANGE (ZC) NO. 04-01, TENTATIVE TRACT MAP 16730 (TT) NO. 04-01 & PRECISE PLAN OF DESIGN (PPD) NO.

04-03 - A request to subdivide 37.59 acres into 263 single-family small lots with 8 lettered lots for parks and open space. The project requires a General Plan Amendment to change the General Plan designation from Mobile Home Subdivision to Mixed Use. The project area currently is not zoned, therefore the project includes a zone change to zone the project area Planned Community (PC). The project will include a Planned Community Document for the small lot subdivision proposal. The project includes the Precise Plan of Design for the product and site design of the single-family residences and the related amenities of the project site. A development agreement will be required for the affordable housing requirement. The project is located south of Mission Road, east of the Pepper Way and the Edison Easement and west of California Street in the City of Loma Linda and County of San Bernardino.

Senior Planner Lamson gave the staff report. She stated that the proposal was a small lot subdivision implementing concepts of the livable walkable community model and neo-traditional neighborhoods supported by the Planning Commission. She added that the project was a request to subdivide approximately 38 acres for the purpose of developing 263 single-family detached residences, three parks, and open space, which includes a trail system. Ms. Lamson stated that the lot sizes along Mission Road would range from approximately 9,000 to 13,500 square feet with the interior lot sizes from approximately 2,800 to 4,789 square feet.

Ms. Lamson continued to say that the proposed medium density complied with the draft General Plan designation for the south side of Mission Road of 5.1 to 9 dwelling units per acre. She added that a General Plan Amendment was being requested to change the existing Mobile Home Subdivision designation to Mixed Use along with a zone change to Planned Community, which is consistent with the draft General Plan. Ms. Lamson commented that this was another example of the need for the completion of the General Plan update, which would make the zoning consistent with the general plan. She added that a Planned Community document was part of the zone change request and would provide the development standards for the project. She stated that a Development Agreement to provide in lieu fees to the City for future affordable housing needs in the City was included in the project was also being proposed.

Senior Planner Lamson explained that there would be three access points off of Mission Road, with the middle access serving as the main entrance, with a center median enhanced by a water feature to simulate an irrigation canal as a focal point. She added that it was the intention of the developer to highlight the history of the area by creating a modern adaptation of an irrigation canal similar to the Zanja.

Senior Planner Lamson continued to say that a Planned Community Zone was also requested that would provide the ability to create streets that are not of standard width as part of the concepts of the livable walkable community model and neo-traditional neighborhoods supported by the Planning Commission in the past. She added that Public Safety had indicated that they could provide access through the proposed development with the narrower streets and that Public Works supported the street width concept.

Ms. Lamson explained that as previously mentioned, the project was proposing to create three parks in the tract, which complied with the General Plan requirement of five acres per 1000 residents. She explained that the central park created a focal point when entering the tract. She continued to say that the proposed water feature at the entrance was continued into the central park and that a tot lot, gazebo, picnic tables, BBQ's, and benches were planned within the shade trees. Ms. Lamson commented that the park on the east side of the tract would include a sand volleyball court, a putting green, a tot lot, picnic tables, BBQ's, and benches and the park on the west side included two half-court basketball courts, a tennis court, tot lot, picnic benches, BBQ's, and benches.

Ms. Lamson continued to say that the three parks were interconnected through a trail system through the tract. She added that it also connected to the other development on the south side of Mission Road and to the regional trail system using a pedestrian bridge leading to the trail along the San Timoteo Channel, in addition to the bridge proposed on the Edison Easement corridor across the channel.

Senior Planner Lamson stated that there were three types of housing products proposed. She described the homes fronting on Mission Road as alley loaded houses with lots ranging between 90' and 104' and designed to have an estate appearance. She added that there were two plans for the Mission Road lots with one being a one-story model.

She explained that all the homes on the interior of the tract were two-story houses with both alley-loaded and front-loaded models having three plan types and each house type having three design concepts ranging from American Farmhouse, and Craftsman type to a Spanish type design.

Senior Planner Lamson continued her report stating that the project had been submitted to the Historical Commission on May 3, 2004 for their review and the approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness due to the project's location in the Mission Historic Overlay District. She added that although the Historical Commission had approved the Certificate of Appropriateness, they requested that their concerns regarding interior lot sizes, density and the developer's failure to contribute to the character and heritage of Loma Linda be forwarded to the Planning Commission and the City Council.

Ms. Lamson commented that staff had received a letter from the Lawrence's at 26430 Margarita Lane in opposition to the development as it pertains to the proposed density. She went on to state that accommodating the request for reduction in the density would mean a change in the draft General Plan Land Use Designation since this project complies with the land use alternative range of density. She explained that the project had been designed with the livable walkable communities concepts as directed by the Planning Commission and that the density of the area south of Mission Road was discussed through many General Plan workshops and identified as medium density of 5.1-9 d.u. per acre by the City Council and the Planning Commission on the Draft General Plan preferred alternative Land Use Plan. She commented that the project complied with this density and provided a cohesive continuation of development of the south side of Mission Road.

Senior Planner Lamson reported that, although staff recommended approval of the project, there were some issues that staff would like to see addressed through the Conditions of Approval.

Color Palette:

There should be more contrast between the proposed trim and stucco colors. Condition No. 1.17 addresses this issue, and Condition No. 1.18 requires that the colors and materials be approved by Community Development staff who would work with the applicant to ensure contrast between the two selected replacement colors.

Site Plan:

The placement of residences on corner lots should be modified to ensure that the wrap around porch and the side entry plans are plotted for the corner lots. Condition No. 1.21 addresses that item, and the placement of the residences on Mission Road should be modified to ensure that the same style of house are not plotted next to each other. This is addressed in Condition No. 1.22.

Ms. Lamson explained that the applicant had provided some alternatives to address parking within the tract by adding more spaces within the proposed open space and park areas. She added that the Planning Commission might want to consider requiring some or all of the additional parking spaces within the parks and open space areas. She stated that a copy of typical parking standards used by the developer had been distributed to the Commissioners to help them see how parking issues had been handled through the CC&R's enforced by the Home Owners Association (HOA) in other projects.

Ms. Lamson concluded her report stating that after additional review, Public Safety had permitted the drives to have two-way traffic with no parking restrictions, which resulted in a modification to Condition No. 2.5 and a modification to the proposed tract map that identified these drives as one way. She added that the Planning Commission might wish to consider these changes when reviewing the map.

Commissioner Rosenbaum had a question regarding the Analysis section of the Staff Report, on page 4. She wanted to know if the additional open space referred to in the first paragraph would be a developed park. Ms. Lamson replied that it would be a landscaped open space area.

Commissioner Christianson requested clarification regarding the letter received from the Lawrence family requesting downsize of the density from 5.1 du per acre to 5 du per acre. Ms. Lamson replied that such a change would require a change in the Preferred Alternative of the General Plan Land Use map.

Chair Neff opened the public comment period at 7:35 pm and invited the applicant to make his presentation.

Mr. John Snell, with American Pacific Homes, 4959 Palo Verde, Ste B110, Montclair, CA. Mr. Snell thanked staff for working with them and added that he agreed with staff on their

interpretation of the General Plan, the Historic District guidelines and compliance with the livable walkable communities concepts. He commented that this project was American Pacific's first in the City of Loma Linda but that they had vast experience with other municipalities and had produced a variety of housing products and worked diligently with all guidelines in these different areas.

Mr. Snell continued to say that the project had gone through several changes to conform to the requirements of the different departments at the City. He added that they had tried to be compatible with existing projects while providing good quality and a variety of architectural styles and details, amenities and parks. He continued to say that Mr. Dan Burden, a renowned expert in the livable walkable communities concepts, was involved with the design of the project and was very impressed with the project and uses it as a demonstration project as he travels throughout the country. Mr. Snell explained that Staff had provided to them all the input that the Planning Commission gave on guidelines and designs at the very beginning of their project and they used the information to create the project being presented.

Mr. Snell stated that it was his understanding that there were no open issues with staff and agreed with the proposed conditions of approval in regards to the additional parking issue. He added that they were prepared to follow the direction that the Commission wished to take.

Mr. Snell stated that he would like to propose a commercial use in the project, not presented at this meeting, an idea that was based on input from the community. He indicated that the lot on the west side of their project fronting Mission Road could be considered for an old style country general store, which would provide a convenient place for residents in the project. Because of the possible future realignment of Mission Road, the commercial uses could be considered for other areas in the project. Mr. Snell stated that if the Planning Commission wished to go ahead with the commercial project, the commercial property could be built in the craftsman style with wood and a rural look.

Mr. Snell introduced Mr. Matt Kohlenberger, a landscape architect from CDPC who played a huge role in providing the park designs. Mr. Kohlenberger, addressed the Commission to explain that to create their design, they had taken into consideration the design guidelines for the Mission Trails project currently under construction, the City's design guidelines, and requirements of the Mission Historic Overlay District Ordinance. He explained that they had identified elements common to this type of development: a Great boulevard, great entries, open space within 800 feet of all the homes, ways to associate neighbors, green streets, low speed streets, pedestrian friendly, many connections, walkways and trails with many of these overlapping elements. He continued to talk about the trees, palm trees for accent, pepper trees, a bridge element at the entry over the canal representing the Zanja and materials, stone pilasters and decomposed granite, monument signage. He continued to describe parks and amenities, such as trails and tree lined streets and walkways, playground equipment, picnic tables, benches and gazebos. He spoke of the rear garage units that spill out into green space.

Mr. Snell stated that, in consideration of the time element and the large number of agenda items, their presentation was complete and that he would be present to answer any questions that the Planning Commission would have.

Chair Neff asked Mr. Snell if the color samples that had been circulated was appropriate for all of the houses. Mr. Snell replied that colors were selected to complement the architecture of the houses.

Commissioner Christianson asked about the treatment for the slope along Barton Road. Mr. Kohlenberger explained that the slope would be landscaped with no wall. Mr. Snell added that the Public Works Director, Jarb Thajpejr had asked them to take over the maintenance of the slope with suitable ground cover and other plant material along with irrigation outside the area that the Department needed to operate the road. He added that the City would retain an easement to maintain the integrity of the road. Mr. Snell added that the Homeowners' Association would do the maintenance of the slope. He mentioned that all of the parks would be opened to the public and the HOA would maintain them.

Mr. Richard Wiley, 10848 Pepper Way, Loma Linda, addressed the Commission to express his concerns with the project. Mr. Wiley's concerns were about making the rooftops less visible from Barton Road, making sure that the proposed orange trees don't conceal the water features, the impact of over watering orange trees, and he suggested that more trees be planted in interior streets.

Mr. Hale Paxton, 26101 Mission Road, addressed the Commission to state his opposition to a commercial area on Mission Road. He continued to request if the fence proposed on the south side of Mission Road to separate his property with the project could be a block wall, as the wood fence was unattractive. He presented his next concern regarding traffic and noise from vehicles

entering and leaving the development east of his property, as his perception was that the road would come up to his property line. Commissioner Christianson asked Mr. Paxton if he would approve a convenience store if it would fit in with the rest of the architecture and style of the tract. Mr. Paxton replied that he couldn't support to any type of commercial designation on Mission Road.

Mr. Jim Stocker, 26234 Mission Road, addressed the Commission and stated that the project was directly across the street from his home and he too would oppose any type of commercial development on Mission Road. He also commented that he would like to know the distance between the front of the garage and the back of the sidewalk to make sure that homeowners would have sufficient space to park their vehicles in the driveway. He added that the density of the project was too high. He concurred with Mr. Paxton that block walls should be constructed to ensure the privacy of the existing homes.

Mr. Ken Beilas, 1510 Orange Avenue, Redlands, spoke in support of the project stating that he had worked in the City of Loma Linda for some time and was anticipating the arrival of the project so that he could purchase a house and move into Loma Linda and be a part of the community. He added that as part of the family-oriented development, he stated that it would be an added convenience to have a corner store for the residents of the area.

Ms. Georgia Hodgkin, 24360 Lawton, Loma Linda, addressed the Planning Commission to urge them to deny the proposed plan to build 263 homes on a mere 37 acres. She compared the size of Hulda Crooks Park, which is 16 acres to the size of the 37 acres of the proposed development and asked if the Commission could envision 131.5 homes there. She continued to say that the proposal to develop so many homes in no way met the basic criteria for development near Mission Road, as indicated in the Mission Road Overlay District. She continued to say that the plan did preserve the rural atmosphere of the area and did not create any link with the history of Mission Road. Ms. Hodgkin also spoke on the concept of the proposed water feature and commented that she could not believe that its connection to the Zanja would be obvious to the residents. She mentioned that she did not believe that sidewalks could be called trails. She stated that no mention was made regarding the depth of the front and back yards and the distance between the homes and that she opposed the use of the term livable/walkable because it was not possible to walk to any businesses located in the area. She concluded her comments by asking the Planning Commission to return the project to the developer with the request that it be made to conform to the historical ordinance.

Mr. Jay Gallant, 26284 Cresthaven Court, Loma Linda, addressed the Commission and stated that the developer has applied many of the neo-traditional concepts, however, in this project, only some of the elements were put into practice. He continued to say that the project does not address issues of a defined rural central area for the neighborhood, which was not defined clearly, there are no shops for the residents or offices at the edge of the neighborhood, no small ancillary building in the backyards that could be used by the owners for rentals or office space, little or no mixing of socio-economic groups addressed, no civic building or prominent site provided on the termination of the street. He continued to say that planning the three projects on Mission Road did not constitute one real neo-traditional design or concept. He concluded his comments by stating that the project should be returned to the developer to be redesigned to achieve the true concept of neo-traditional and he added that he felt that the project was designed in favor of the developer not the City of Loma Linda and that there was no soul for the neighborhood.

Chair Neff closed the public comment period at 8:30 pm and asked Mr. Snell if he could provide responses to the comments from the audience.

Mr. Snell addressed the issue of parking stating that all garage-fronted homes had 16 feet from the property line to the garage face and that there was a little more space between the property line and the sidewalk. He next responded to the comments that sidewalks were not trails by stating that the project provided both sidewalks and trails, which are distinguished by their extra width, their coloring and decorative pattern. Mr. Snell stated that they would more than happy to build block walls around the existing residences to cut down on the noise, and he added that this would be a split-face block wall with a capstone on it. Director Woldruff stated that it was something that was required and that staff would look into Mr. Paxton's concerns about the adjacent development and she believed that they should be constructing a block wall. Senior Planner Lamson replied that the design guidelines approved by the Planning Commission and City Council for the other project included wood fences only for the area around Mr. Paxton's property. She recommended that a condition be added that would say:

"A 5-foot high block wall be constructed adjacent to the lot line adjacent to the property on the west side of the tract and that the block wall shall be split-faced block with landscaping planted adjacent to the wall for softening the wall appearance. The colors, materials and plant materials shall be reviewed and approved by Community Development Department."

Chair Neff concurred with the addition of the condition. Director Woldruff stated that staff would add the item to the Planning Commission checklist as a component. The Chair asked Mr. Snell if he had any comments regarding the issue of traffic and noise. Mr. Snell replied that Mission Road and the interior streets in conjunction with the block were designed to slow traffic, as it was the most effective way to accomplish traffic calming.

Mr. Kohlenberger responded to the comments on landscaping, particularly the view of a park setting when traveling on Barton Road to hide the rooflines. He replied that there would be lots of stately and broad-spreading street trees appropriate to the wide streets. On the issue of the citrus trees, he explained that in the area of the water feature, there was a setting of decomposed granite and that the citrus would have a separate irrigation systems appropriate for the needs of the citrus trees. He added that the trees would be trimmed so that passers-by could see under and around them.

Chair Neff requested more information in regards to the suggestion for a commercial use. He polled the other Commissioners to get their input and discuss with staff. Director Woldruff explained that when the Historic Mission Overlay District was being formulated, there was a consensus of the people who attended the workshops that the south side of Mission Road was not an appropriate area for commercial uses and that was why that area was specifically left out. She added that the Mission area constitutes a planning area that has many component parts. The south side was considered to be most appropriate for residential, except for the node at California Street. She added that other livable/walkable community components would be added throughout the Planning area and the entire area was planned as a livable/walkable community.

Chair Neff asked if the area near the intersection of California and Mission Road was more likely to be designated for commercial use. Director Woldruff concurred and added that the draft General Plan calls for the realignment of Mission Road to connect with Orange Street to create a larger community node on California Street.

Commissioner Christianson commented that the Land Use Element of the draft General Plan was very clear that this area should be designated used for live/work artisan uses and buildings. He stated that if there were no commercial to support a development of this size on Mission Road, he would be in favor of having a live-above small-store below type of development within the community next to one of the trails or parks to accommodate the local residents and this use would still conform to the livable/walkable community concepts.

Commissioner Umeda stated that the proposed commercial use was not sufficient to serve this neighborhood. He added that if the Planning Commission wished to establish neo-traditional neighborhoods, the City needed to develop a village-commercial center plan on the north of Mission Road that would serve these communities in a village setting that would offer all types of services.

Commissioner Rosenbaum stated that she was in favor of some sort of commercial so the residents could take advantage of the proximity of services near their community.

Chair Neff asked if staff could provide insight into the issue of commercial development in the project. Director Woldruff stated that she could address some of the comments. She explained that the approach to Mission Road was awkward because there was not a single property owner and the task as planners was to ensure that the component parts were present when the entire area was developed. She continued to say that there would be a commercial component at the east end of the south side of Mission Road, we know that there are two proposals for the north side that would incorporate village centers. She stated that there were many home occupations in Loma Linda and therefore the south side of Mission Road was designated as an area where the concept would work and that the artisan language was just one example of what could go there. She added that the language in the General Plan should probably be changed to include more examples that identify administrative offices and/or professionals. Director Woldruff suggested that if the Planning Commission cannot come to a consensus on the issue of commercial, the Commission might want to refer it to City Council for their review in a public hearing process.

In response to a question from Chair Neff, Director Woldruff stated that if any commercial component were to be proposed for that area, it would be brought before the Planning Commission as a Precise Plan of Design in a public hearing.

Commissioner Christianson commented that he would rather see residents of Loma Linda to shop in their own neighborhood or in the City of Loma Linda.

There were no comments brought for discussion in the Negative Declaration Initial Study, the Planned Community Document, the Development Agreement, or the Tentative Tract Map 16730.

Chair Neff opened the discussion on the Conditions of Approval.

Commissioner Rosenbaum requested discussion on the issue of solid fencing and commented that she would like to see the Planning Commission search for alternatives for solid fencing to promote interaction between neighbors. Mr. Snell explained that on one side the property owner gets the use of his property and a portion of his neighbor's property. At the backyard there is a fence that defines the private rear yard and he proposed that there should be solid fencing to retain the privacy. Commissioner Rosenbaum reiterated that she wanted the Planning Commission to start thinking in the direction of different kinds of separations between the homes, maybe not in this particular case, but for future projects. Chair Neff pointed out that in other projects, the Planning Commission had substituted wrought iron fencing along with the block wall to open up the spaces. Commissioner Umeda supported the idea of block walls for privacy.

The Conditions of Approval were discussed.

Chair Neff returned to the discussion of the proposal for a commercial concept in the project. Director Woldruff stated that technically, the commercial use had not been formally proposed to date and was not advertised in terms of the project description or considered in the environmental document; therefore, it could not be recommended to the City Council for approval. She continued to say that the way to address it would be to add a compromise to the Planned Community document for a provision that commercial may be considered at a future date and further defined as neighborhood commercial. The process would involve as an amendment to the Planned Community document and a Conditional Use Permit (CUP).

Chair Neff stated that he was opposed to the commercial as presented but would reconsider the matter when additional information was available. Director Woldruff stated that the matter could be referred to in the Staff Report to the City Council indicating that it had been added and the Council could determine to include it or not.

It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to not make any reference or recommendation in the matter of the commercial use, as any future request would have to be resubmitted for the Commission's review and approval.

Chair Neff opened the discussion on Precise Plan of Design (PPD) No. 04-03. He stated that color material boards had been circulated to the Commissioners and asked staff to explain what the issues that staff had with the color scheme. Senior Planner Lamson explained that language had been added to Condition No. 1.17 to address the contrast between the base colors for the certain schemes.

Condition No. 1.17 reads as follows:

The proposed color schemes, specifically the wall base color, shall be modified to create more of a contrasting difference between the base colors for the following schemes:

1. Schemes #5 and #15;
2. Schemes #13, #14, and #4;
3. Schemes #3 and #8;
4. Schemes #7 and #12; and,
5. Schemes #1, #2, and #11

Commissioner Rosenbaum asked to discuss the elements of the house plans. She pointed out that some of the garages were windowless. Mr. Snell stated that he would like to work with staff on the selection of garage doors styles because there were new styles of garage doors that not only have windows but also have distinctive designs. Senior Planner Lamson clarified that Commissioner Rosenbaum wanted additional windows not just windows on the door but also on the walls. After further discussion, Commissioner Rosenbaum withdrew her request.

Commissioner Rosenbaum stated that she would like a wrap around porch on Plan 1900.

Chair Neff pointed out that the Planning Commission had established a checklist to developers regarding issues that affect all development. He asked staff if the list could be incorporated into the conditions of approval. Senior Planner Lamson replied that the list was provided to the developer in the design stage to ensure that all of the issues are taken into consideration, but not all of the issues apply.

As to the issue of the wrap around porch for Plan 1900, Ms. Lamson stated that she would like to ask Mr. Snell about setbacks. Commissioner Rosenbaum added that she would like a wrap around porch on Plan 2100 also although it may not be possible because of the location. Ms. Lamson concurred with Commissioner Rosenbaum, stating that on Plans 1700 and 2700, which have wrap around porches, had been located on corner lots. Mr. Snell replied that he would

add the porches on Plans 1900 and 2100 where the elevation was appropriate. Ms. Lamson stated that a condition could be added that would say: "Where appropriate, staff will work with the applicant to add wrap around porches to Plans 1900 and 2100."

Commissioner Rosenbaum pointed to Plan 2100, on the right side elevation and asked about the possibility of adding a window to bedroom #2 to address the blank wall. Mr. Snell replied that they do occur on corners and other public areas. He went on to say that he could add a window wherever possible. Senior Planner Lamson suggested a condition that would say: "Additional windows will be added to the right side of Plan 2100 to break up the massing of the blank wall."

Commissioner Rosenbaum pointed to the Mission Road Plan 2 model and stated that there was no window in the kitchen. Senior Planner Lamson replied that the kitchen opened up to the nook and the family room. She commented that adding a window in the kitchen in the Ryland Homes project did not complement the design of the house. Mr. Snell responded that there a window over the sink had been part of the design.

Commissioner Rosenbaum wished to discuss the landscape plans.

Commissioner Christianson wished to comment on the issue of density in the project. He stated that although the Lawrences' request to reduce the density to 5.0 d.u. per acre would force a change in the General Plan, he would also like to see the density decreased. However, he added that, by his calculations, a decreased density would reduce the number of houses by only 68 homes and would not change the overall look of the tract.

Commissioner Rosenbaum commented that the tot lot equipment and design must be accessible to all children with any type of handicaps not simply to kids in wheelchairs. The applicant confirmed that tot lot equipment in the project was accessible to all children.

Commissioner Rosenbaum asked for clarification on the parking issue. Senior Planner Lamson replied that the applicant provided concepts for additional parking. She added that a Condition of Approval requiring that all of the concepts be implemented. Chair Neff stated that he would recommend that the applicant provide all of the additional parking as shown on the plans. Mr. Snell pointed out that if all of the parking spaces were required, the sidewalks would have to be realigned to go around the parking areas. He continued to say that the on-street and parking spaces were for guests and the Association would establish regulations, such as parking permit, for homeowners who owned several vehicles.

A discussion regarding the permitted use of a homeowner's garage ensued. Commissioner Christianson stated that the example regulations provided to the Commission about the use of the garage space were too restrictive. Mr. Snell explained that the language in the CC&Rs should say that any of the activities in the garage space should not preclude the ability to park in the garage. Senior Planner Lamson added that the language of the CC&Rs was only an example provided by the applicant. She stated that staff would work with the applicant to prepare the language for the CC&Rs.

Chair Neff asked for the consensus of the Commissioners on the issue of parking. Commissioner Rosenbaum stated that she did not want to realign the sidewalks to go around the proposed parking area, therefore, did not want the additional parking. Commissioner Umeda stated that it was a good idea to add parking spaces to the fullest extent of what was being proposed. Commissioner Rosenbaum stated that she was open to some additional parking but not the full amount being proposed. Senior Planner Lamson proposed adding the parking along the open space along the bank going up to Barton Road and possibly where the diagonal parking was located on the plans as appropriate areas. It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to approve adding 22 parking spaces at the bottom and 10 at the top of the embankment. Mr. Snell concurred.

Senior Planner Lamson indicated that she would amend Condition No. 1.28 to reflect the Commission's decision.

In response to Commissioner Rosenbaum's question on Plan LC-8, Mr. Snell explained that what she saw on the drawing was a picket fence that the developer would install because that particular house faced a park and the 30-36" picket fence was to separate the property from the park.

Motion by Rosenbaum, seconded by Neff, and carried by a vote of 3-1, Umeda opposed, to forward to City Council to Adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration; Approve and adopt General Plan Amendment No. 04-01 and Zone Change No. 04-01, based on the Findings; Approve the Development Agreement; and, Approve Tentative Tract Map No. 16730 and Precise Plan

of Design No. 04-03 based on the Findings, and subject to the Conditions of Approval as amended and to Approve the Planned Community document.

Director Woldruff asked Chair Neff if he wanted to change the order of the next following agenda items, as discussed at the beginning of the meeting. Senior Planner Lamson explained that it was the request of the applicant to have TTM No. 15422 heard first. It was the consensus to address the items as they were placed on the agenda.

PC-04-35 - PRECISE PLAN OF DESIGN (PPD) NO. 04-05. - A request to construct 51 single-family homes on 11.1 acres located on the northeast corner of Whittier Avenue at First Street. The site was previously approved for subdivision via Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 15422.

Assistant Planner Raul Colunga presented the staff report describing Precise Plan of Design (PPD) No. 04-05 as a request to develop Tract Map No. 15422, which was approved by the City Council in November 2002, with 52 houses on 11.1 acres at the northeast corner of Whittier at First Street in the Bryn Mawr area. He added that the project was of medium density designation of 5.1-9 dwelling units per acre. Mr. Colunga pointed out that the applicant had revised the tract map and submitted a site plan that showed 51 lots, three lettered lots and a new park space, which was not part of the original approval for the Tract Map.

Mr. Colunga explained that during the Planning Commission's review of the Tentative Tract Map in October 2002, the following comments and conditions to the tract were provided for future residential design:

- A landscape berm and minimum six-foot high block wall constructed on top of the berm shall be located along First Street and Whittier Avenue to reduce the interior and exterior noise levels of the proposed single-family homes.
- Corner lots shall be side loaded.
- A line of site study was to be provided addressing concerns that the future houses would not completely impair the views of the San Bernardino Mountains to the north for those residents living on the south side of First Street.

Mr. Colunga stated that the applicant had provided a line of site survey as part of the review, along with photographs taken from the south side of First Street. He continued to say that the Plan 1 house, which is a 1½ -story model, would be built on Lots 1 and 37, to maintain the view of the mountains to the north from First Street.

Mr. Colunga described the proposed housing product as consisting of four architectural styles, with modern adaptations of Craftsmen, Farmhouse, French Country and Traditional designs in four color palettes for each of the three floor plans. He continued to say the houses ranged from 1,854 to 2,552 square feet. Mr. Colunga commented that the applicant would be adding flower boxes to the windows on the second floor of Plan 2C models to enhance the appearance from the street, and that the Conditions of Approval would be amended to reflect the added features. He explained that the applicant had addressed the issue of the corner lots by placing Plan 2AX models on those lots. This is a two-story house with the front door facing the side street.

Mr. Colunga listed the amenities, which included a 6,000 square foot public park space furnished with Playworld Systems playground equipment, shade structures, benches and a picnic table plus an area for the placement of a 10' X 10' brick building to house the Community Hub required as part of the Loma Linda Connected Communities Program.

Mr. Colunga discussed the 4:1 berm on the north side of First Street that was being required to mitigate the noise from the Union Pacific Railroad. He continued to say that the applicant had provided a Landscape Plan for both sides of the berm, the one facing First Street and the interior side.

Assistant Planner Colunga explained that the project was presented to the Parks, Recreation and Beautification Committee at their meeting of June 7, 2004 for their review and approval. He continued to say that the Committee requested that the applicant add shade elements for the park benches and picnic table, which the applicant has provided. Mr. Colunga pointed out the location of Community Hub.

Mr. Colunga commented that a Planned Community document, which listed design criteria and standards, had been provided for review along with a plan for the building phases, the map for the sales models, floor plans and landscaping.

Assistant Planner Colunga stated that the proposed use was consistent with the existing General Plan and the Draft Preferred Land Use Alternative prepared for the City's Comprehensive General Plan Update Project. He added that the project was in compliance with the Planned Community (PC) zoning regulations. He added that the proposed house designs would respect and enhance the character of the Bryn Mawr area and with the implementation of the Conditions of Approval would be compatible with the surrounding area.

He concluded his comments stating that the applicant had worked closely with Community Development staff and had made every effort possible to provide the most appropriate layout, design, and architecture for this project. He added that staff was available for comments as well as the representatives from Richmond American Homes and their consultants.

Chair Neff invited the members of the audience who had submitted a request to address the Planning Commission to come to the podium to provide their comments.

Mr. Fred Ramos, 26445 First Street, Bryn Mawr, addressed the Planning Commission and stated that he lived across the street from the proposed project. He circulated three photographs for the Commission's consideration. He explained that the first two photographs represented the landscape before the work in the San Timoteo Creek had been started and added that the Morgan Tract project could not have even been considered before the Army Corps of Engineers did the work, because the area was a flood plain. He continued to say that the third picture was the condition of the area at the present time with the trees removed. He added that the area was a citrus grove from the 1930s to the 1950s and that pesticides had been used during that time and mentioned that the soil should be tested to ensure that there was no residual contamination.

Mr. Ramos commented on the issue of the berm and the 6-foot wall and added that because there were two other walls in the area, he was concerned that the combination of the three sound barriers would cause reverberation through the neighborhoods. Mr. Ramos concluded his comments stating that he would like to propose a meeting between the residents of the Bryn Mawr, the applicant and their consultants to discuss the project.

Chair Neff explained that he had provided him the opportunity of speaking first so that the applicant could answer his concerns.

Director Woldruff in reference to Mr. Ramos' concerns reminded the Planning Commission that some of the components he was concerned about had been approved through the Tract Map and could not be changed.

Pam Pullen with Richmond American Homes thanked staff for working with them to produce the PPD being presented to the Planning Commission. She added that their consultants were present to answer any technical questions the Commission might have. Chair Neff asked Ms. Pullen to explain the design concepts and the various features of the tract. Ms. Pullen introduced the Land Planner for the project, Mr. Ken Rome.

Mr. Ken Rome of Rome Planning, 22772 Center Drive, Ste 270, Lake Forest, CA stated that, as Director Woldruff had mentioned, they were presenting the Precise Plan of Design for approved Tract Map 15422. He explained that the concept of the project was a loop system with two points of access and the required berm on First Street. He continued to say that they were proposing a small lot subdivision, featuring a public park, with three housing plan types, which included front porches on most of the units.

Commissioner Rosenbaum commented that she would like to see some type of use for youth twelve to eighteen, such as a half basketball court. Senior Planner Lamson replied that there was no space left once the lot was planned because of the requirement for a Connected Communities hub in that location. She added that at the time the tract map was approved, there had been no plans for a park in that location.

Commissioner Rosenbaum pointed out that two-thirds of the house plans in the project presented garages very close to the front of the property. She commented that the Planning Commission had discussed the issue of requiring applicants to design plans with garages pushed back from the sidewalk. Chair Neff retorted that the Commission was looking for a variety of architecture along with enough room from the garage to the back of the sidewalk for guest parking in the driveway.

Mr. Don White, William Hezmalhalch Architects, Inc., explained that the concept was to provide a variety of garage configurations with some pushed back as far as the design would allow while others were closer to the sidewalk to maximize the square footage of the 1½ -story model.

Chair Neff commented that the elevations were too plain on some of the models. He asked staff if the builder had received the developer checklist. Senior Planner Lamson replied that they had been provided with the checklist, pertinent minutes, a comprehensive list of all projects that were submitted and the issues derived from those projects. A discussion ensued regarding the possibility of adding some architectural features to the side elevations to enhance the large expanses of stucco. Mr. White agreed that accent windows could be added to provide for a view and another source of light.

Commissioner Rosenbaum requested that Plan 2A be designed with a wrap around porch and added that she was disappointed by the lack of four-sided architecture. Commissioner Christianson concurred.

Chair Neff suggested that each Commissioner provide appropriate suggestions regarding changes for each of the plans. The applicant commented that some of the plans did not lend themselves to having windows, but that if the Commission recommended the addition of accent windows he would work with staff to do so. The Planning Commission did not require any changes to Plan 1 but did recommend the addition of an architectural element to enhance the look of a large blank stucco walls in Plan 2A.

Chair Neff suggested that the plans be brought back to the Planning Commission and that staff might work with the applicant to add architectural features to the elevations and concentrate on the development guidelines justifying the designs and providing mitigation measures for areas that cannot be addressed as required.

Commissioner Rosenbaum wished to discuss the landscape plans, particularly Sheet L5 and indicated her concerns that the areas that were not depicted on the plans would not be landscaped. Mr. Robert Mitchell from Robert Mitchell and Associates explained that all areas would be landscaped with shrubs at the base of the house as foundation planting and turf from the front to the sidewalk. A discussion ensued regarding the requirements of the approved tentative tract map and the types of trees proposed in regards to different species size and color.

It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to direct staff to work with the applicant to bring the project back to the Commission showing the required changes.

Chair Neff asked if the drainage plan was part of the PPD. Senior Planner Lamson explained that there were issues regarding a drainage problem at the Whittier and First Street intersection that was addressed at the time the tract map was approved. She added that the applicant would be responsible for correcting that as part of their development. Mr. Francisco Martinez, representative of the civil engineer firm spoke about the drainage issue and stated that the project was not adding any new flow on First Street and that the drainage pattern, as it currently existed, drained towards the San Timoteo Creek Channel. He added that they would be providing a catch basin to mitigate the flooding issues at the a low point, which is the intersection of First Street and Whittier.

Chair Neff closed the public comment period at 10:40 pm.

Pam Pullen requested that the project be approved and the applicant be allowed to work with staff to address the four-sided architecture to reduce the massing on the elevation. Chair Neff commented that he would like to continue the approval of the project to the next regular meeting in August.

Chair Neff added that Commissioner Rosenbaum could provide City staff with a list of suggestions regarding landscaping, and possibly the window treatment.

Motion by Christianson, seconded by Umeda, and carried by a vote of 4-0, to continue Precise Plan of Design (PPD) No. 04-05, a request to construct 51 single-family homes on 11.1 acres located on the northeast corner of Whittier Avenue at First Street to the next regular meeting on August 4, 2004.

PC-04-36 - PRECISE PLAN OF DESIGN (PPD) NO. 04-06 - A request to construct fifty (50) single-family homes on a 6.97-acre site located on the south side of Newport Avenue, west of Bryn Mawr Avenue and south of Barton Road. The site was previously approved for subdivision via Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 16382.

Director Woldruff asked that, if the concerns of the Planning Commission on TTM 15422 could carry true for TTM 16382, staff might work with the applicant to apply the changes to both projects wherever applicable, as the projects were being presented by the same builder. Mr. Mitchell, of Robert Mitchell and Associates stated that he would be happy to work with staff to address any comments or suggestions on either of the projects.

Motion by Christianson, seconded by Umeda, and carried by a vote of 3-1, Rosenbaum opposing, to continue Precise Plan of Design (PPD) No. 04-06, a request to construct fifty (50) single-family homes on a 6.97-acre site located on the south side of Newport Avenue, west of Bryn Mawr Avenue and south of Barton Road.

PC-04-37 - APPROVAL OF MINUTES – Minutes of the Adjourned Regular meetings of March 17 and March 31, 2004

Motion by Christianson, seconded by Rosenbaum, and carried by a vote of 3-1, Commissioner Umeda abstaining, to approve the Minutes of the Adjourned Regular meetings of March 17 and March 31, 2004 as presented.

Director Woldruff explained that there were outstanding minutes that would never receive a quorum because of the departure of Mr. Patel and that she would request advisement from the City Clerk, Pam O'Camb regarding the procedure to have the minutes approved.

Chair Neff requested new packets showing the suggested changes. Director Woldruff stated that staff would provide the Commission with the new information.

REPORTS BY THE PLANNING COMMISSIONERS

There were no reports by the Planning Commissioners.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR REPORT

No reports were presented.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Neff, seconded by Christianson, and unanimously carried to adjourn to the Adjourned Regular meeting of July 21, 2004.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:50 pm

Minutes approved at the regular meeting of August 25, 2004.

Administrative Secretary

I:\PlanningCom (PC)\PC 2004\04Jul07M-app.doc